arXiv:1510.05517v2 [math.PR] 14 Feb 2016

Sparse Hanson-Wright inequalities for subgaussian quadratic forms

Shuheng Zhou
Department of Statistics,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
shuhengz@umich.edu

February 16, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we provide a proof for the Hanson-Wright inequalities for sparsified quadratic forms in subgaussian random variables. This provides useful concentration inequalities for sparse subgaussian random vectors in two ways. Let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$ be a random vector with independent subgaussian components, and $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m) \in \{0,1\}^m$ be independent Bernoulli random variables. We prove the large deviation bound for a sparse quadratic form of $(X \circ \xi)^T A (X \circ \xi)$, where $A \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times m}$ is an $m \times m$ matrix, and random vector $X \circ \xi$ denotes the Hadamard product of an isotropic subgaussian random vector $X \in \mathbf{R}^m$ and a random vector $\xi \in \{0,1\}^m$ such that $(X \circ \xi)_i = X_i \xi_i$, where $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m$ are independent Bernoulli random variables. The second type of sparsity in a quadratic form comes from the setting where we randomly sample the elements of an anisotropic subgaussian vector $Y = D_0 X$ where $D_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times m}$ is an $m \times m$ symmetric matrix; we study the large deviation bound on the ℓ_2-norm $\|D_\xi Y\|_2^2$ from its expected value, where for a given vector $x \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $D_x = \mathrm{diag}(x)$ denotes the diagonal matrix whose main diagonal entries are the entries of x. This form arises naturally from the context of covariance estimation.

Keywords: Hanson-Wright inequality; Subgaussian concentration; Sparse quadratic forms.

AMS 2010 Subject Classification: 60B20.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we explore the concentration of measure results for quadratic forms involving a sparse subgaussian random vector $X \in \mathbf{R}^m$. Sparsity can naturally come from the fact that the high dimensional vector $X \in \mathbf{R}^m$ is sparse, for example, when the elements of X are missing at random, or when we intentionally sparsify the vector X to speed up computation. The purpose of the paper is to prove the Hanson-Wright type of large deviation bounds for sparse quadratic forms in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Sparsity comes in two forms. In Theorems 1.1, we randomly sparsify the subgaussian vector X involved in the quadratic form $X^T A X$, where $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$ is a random vector with independent subgaussian components, and $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m) \in \{0,1\}^m$ consists of independent Bernoulli random variables. In particular, we first consider $(X \circ \xi)^T A (X \circ \xi)$, where $X \circ \xi \in \mathbf{R}^m$ denotes the Hadamard product of random vectors X and ξ such that $(X \circ \xi)_i = X_i \xi_i$ and A is an $m \times m$ matrix. The second type of sparsity

comes into play when we sample the elements of an anisotropic subgaussian random vector $Y = D_0 X$ where $X \in \mathbf{R}^m$ is as defined in Theorem 1.1 and $D_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times m}$ is an $m \times m$ symmetric matrix.

The bound in Theorem 1.2 allows the second type of sparsity in a quadratic form in the following sense. Suppose A_0 is an $m \times m$ symmetric positive semidefinite matrix and $A_0^{1/2}$ is the unique square root of A_0. Suppose we randomly sample the rows or columns of $A_0^{1/2}$ to construct a quadratic form as follows,

$$X^T A_0^{T/2} A_0^{1/2} X \to X^T A_0^{1/2} D_\xi A_0^{1/2} X. \tag{1}$$

We state in Theorem 1.2, where we replace $A_0^{1/2}$ with D_0, a symmetric $m \times m$ matrix, the large deviation bound for the sparse quadratic form on the right hand side of (1). These questions arise naturally in the context of covariance estimation problems, where we naturally take A_0 and D_0 as symmetric positive (semi)definite matrices.

The following definitions correspond to Definitions 5.7 and 5.13 in [14]. For a random variable X, the sub-gaussian (or ψ_2) norm of X denoted by $\|X\|_{\psi_2}$ is defined to be [14]:

$$\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{p\geq 1} p^{-1/2} (\mathbb{E}\,|X|^p)^{1/p} \quad \text{which is the smallest } K_2 \tag{2}$$

$$\text{which satisfies} \quad (\mathbb{E}\,|X|^p)^{1/p} \leq K_2 \sqrt{p} \quad \forall p \geq 1; \tag{3}$$

$$\text{if } \mathbb{E}[X] = 0, \text{ then } \mathbb{E}\exp(tX) \leq \exp(Ct^2 \|X\|_{\psi_2}^2) \text{ for all } \quad t \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{4}$$

For a random variable X, the sub-exponential (or ψ_1) norm of X denoted by $\|X\|_{\psi_1}$ is defined to be the smallest K_2 which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbb{E}\,|X|^p)^{1/p} \leq K_2 p \;\forall p \geq 1; \quad \text{in other words} \\ &\|X\|_{\psi_1} = \sup_{p\geq 1} p^{-1} (\mathbb{E}\,|X|^p)^{1/p}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Throughout this paper $C_0, C, C_1, c, c_1, \ldots$ denote positive absolute constants whose value may change from line to line. For a vector $X \in \mathbf{R}^m$, let X_{Λ_δ} denote $(X_i)_{i\in\Lambda_\delta}$ for a set $\Lambda_\delta \subseteq [m]$. For a symmetric matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times m}$, we let $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ denote the largest and the smallest eigenvalue of A respectively. Moreover, we order the m eigenvalues algebraically and denote them by

$$\lambda_{\min}(A) = \lambda_1(A) \leq \lambda_2(A) \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_m(A) = \lambda_{\max}(A).$$

For a matrix A, the operator norm $\|A\|_2$ is defined to be $\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^T A)}$. Let $\|A\|_F = (\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$. Let $\mathrm{diag}(A)$ be the diagonal of A. Let $\mathrm{offd}(A)$ be the off-diagonal of A. For matrix A, $r(A)$ denotes the effective rank $\mathrm{tr}(A)/\|A\|_2$. For two numbers a, b, $a \vee b := \max(a, b)$. In particular, we prove:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$ be a random vector with independent components X_i which satisfy $\mathbb{E}X_i = 0$ and $\|X_i\|_{\psi_2} \leq K$. Let $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m) \in \{0,1\}^m$ be a random vector independent of X, with independent Bernoulli random variables ξ_i such that $\mathbb{E}(\xi_i) = p_i$. Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $m \times m$ matrix. Then, for every $t > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left|(X\circ\xi)^T A (X\circ\xi) - \mathbb{E}(X\circ\xi)^T A (X\circ\xi)\right| > t\right) \leq \\ &\qquad 2\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{K^4\left(\sum_{k=1}^m p_k a_{kk}^2 + \sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j\right)}, \frac{t}{K^2\|A\|_2}\right)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $X \circ \xi$ denotes the Hadamard product of random vectors X and ξ such that $(X\circ\xi)_i = X_i\xi_i$.

Let ξ be as defined in Theorem 1.1. We now randomly sample entries of a correlated subgaussian random vector $Y = D_0 X$ and study the large deviation bound on the norm of $\|D_\xi Y\|_2^2$ from its expected value in Theorem 1.2, where for a given $x \in \mathbf{R}^m$, $D_x = \mathrm{diag}(x)$ denotes the diagonal matrix whose main diagonal entries are the elements of x. And we write $D_x := \mathrm{diag}(x)$ interchangeably. Partition a symmetric matrix $D_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times m}$ according to its columns as $D_0 = [d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m]$. Denote by

$$A_0 \;\; := \;\; D_0^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m d_i d_i^T = (a_{ij}) \succeq 0. \tag{7}$$

The bounds in Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 reduce to essentially the same type.

Theorem 1.2. *Let X, ξ be as defined in Theorem 1.1. Let D_ξ be a diagonal matrix with elements from the random vector $\xi \in \{0,1\}^m$, where $\mathbb{E}\xi_j = p_j$, for $0 \le p_j \le 1$. Partition an $m \times m$ symmetric matrix D_0 according to its columns as $D_0 = [d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m]$. Let $A_0 = (a_{ij}) = D_0^2$. Let $a_\infty := \max_i a_{ii}$. Let $Y = D_0 X$. Then, for every $t > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left|Y^T D_\xi Y - \mathbb{E}Y^T D_\xi Y\right| > t\right) =: \mathbb{P}\left(|S| > t\right) \\ &\quad\le \;\; 2\exp\left(-c_2 \min\left(\frac{t^2}{K^4(\sum_{i=1}^m p_i a_{ii}^2 + \sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j)}, \frac{t}{K^2\left\|A_0\right\|_2}\right)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where c_2, C are some absolute constants.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we compare our results with those in the literature. We then prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 3 and Theorem 1.2 in Section 4.

2 Consequences and related work

In this section, we first compare with the following form of the Hanson-Wright inequality as recently derived in [12], as well as an even more closely related result in [11]. Such concentration of measure bounds were originally proved by [7, 15]. The bound as stated in Theorem 2.1 is proved in [12].

Theorem 2.1. *[12] Let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_m) \in \mathbf{R}^m$ be a random vector with independent components X_i which satisfy $\mathbb{E}X_i = 0$ and $\|X_i\|_{\psi_2} \le K$. Let A be an $m \times m$ matrix. Then, for every $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|X^T A X - \mathbb{E}X^T A X\right| > t\right) \le 2\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{K^4\left\|A\right\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{K^2\left\|A\right\|_2}\right)\right).$$

When X is a vector whose coordinates are ± 1 Bernoulli random variables, the following Lemma in the same spirit as in Theorem 1.1 is shown in [11].

Lemma 2.2. *([11]) Let J be a random subset of $[m]$ of size $k < m$ uniformly chosen among all such subsets. Denote by $R_J = \sum_{j\in J} e_j e_j^T$ the coordinate projection on the set J. Let $Y = (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_m)$ be vector whose coordinates are ± 1 Bernoulli Random variables. Then for any $m \times m$ matrix A and any $t > 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left|Y^T R_J A R_J Y - \mathbb{E}Y^T R_J A R_J Y\right| > t\right) \\ &\quad\le \;\; 2\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{k\left\|A\right\|_2^2}, \frac{t}{\left\|A\right\|_2}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Other related results include [10, 9, 5, 2, 6, 1]. We refer to [12] for a survey of these and other related results.

Clearly, the large deviation bounds in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are determined by the following quantity $\bar{M} := \sum_{i=1}^m p_i a_{ii}^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j$. We now state some consequences of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in Corollaries 2.3 and 2.4. Lemma 2.2 and Corollaries 2.3 and 2.4 show essentially a large deviation bound at roughly the same order given that $p \left\| \mathrm{diag}(A) \right\|_F^2 + p^2 \left\| \mathrm{offd}(A) \right\|_F^2 \leq pm \left\| A \right\|_2^2$ while $k \left\| A \right\|_2^2 = \frac{k}{m} m \left\| A \right\|_2^2$. The following Corollary 2.3 follows from Theorem 1.1 immediately.

Corollary 2.3. *Let X, ξ be as defined in Theorem 1.1. Let $p_1 = p_2 = \ldots = p_m = p$. Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $m \times m$ matrix. Then, for every $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left| X^T D_\xi A D_\xi X - \mathbb{E} X^T D_\xi A D_\xi X \right| > t \right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-c \min\left(\frac{t^2}{K^4 \left(p \left\| \mathrm{diag}(A) \right\|_F^2 + p^2 \left\| \mathrm{offd}(A) \right\|_F^2 \right)}, \frac{t}{K^2 \left\| A \right\|_2} \right) \right).$$

Corollary 2.4. *Let D_0, A_0, X, ξ, Y be as defined in Theorem 1.2. Let $p_1 = p_2 = \ldots = p_m = p$. Then, for every $t > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| Y^T D_\xi Y - \mathbb{E} Y^T D_\xi Y \right| > t \right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \left\| D_\xi D_0 X \right\|_2^2 - \mathbb{E} \left\| D_\xi D_0 X \right\|_2^2 \right| > t \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-c \min\left(\frac{t^2}{K^4 (p \left\| \mathrm{diag}(A_0) \right\|_F^2 + p^2 \left\| \mathrm{offd}(A_0) \right\|_F^2)}, \frac{t}{K^2 \left\| A_0 \right\|_2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.5. *Suppose all conditions in Corollary 2.3 hold. Suppose $EX_i^2 = 1$ and*

$$p = \Omega\left(\frac{\log m \left\| A \right\|_2}{\mathrm{tr}(A)} \right). \tag{9}$$

Then with probability at least $1 - 4/m^4$,

$$\left| X^T D_\xi A D_\xi X \right| \leq p \mathrm{tr}(A)(1 + o(1)).$$

Proof. Define

$$S = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} (X_i \xi_i X_j \xi_j - \mathbb{E} X_i \xi_i X_j \xi_j).$$

Thus $\mathbb{E} S = \sum_i a_{ii} \mathbb{E} X_i^2 \mathbb{E} \xi_i = p \mathrm{tr}(A)$. We have under conditions of Theorem 1.1, with probability at least $1 - 4/m^4$, for some absolute constant C,

$$\begin{aligned} |S| &:= \left| X^T D_\xi A D_\xi X - p \mathrm{tr}(A) \right| \\ &\leq C K^2 \log^{1/2} m \left(\log^{1/2} m \left\| A \right\|_2 + \sqrt{p} \left\| \mathrm{diag}(A) \right\|_F + p \left\| \mathrm{offd}(A) \right\|_F \right) =: t \end{aligned}$$

where under condition (9), the deviation term is of a small order of the expected value $p \mathrm{tr}(A)$; that is,

$$t \asymp \log m \left\| A \right\|_2 + \log^{1/2} m (\sqrt{p} \left\| \mathrm{diag}(A) \right\|_F + p \left\| A \right\|_F) =: I + II = o(p \mathrm{tr}(A)).$$

To see this, notice that (9) immediately implies that the first term in t is of $o(p \mathrm{tr}(A))$. Now in order for the second and third term to be of $o(p \mathrm{tr}(A))$, we need that

$$\sqrt{p} \left\| A \right\|_F \log^{1/2} m \ll p \mathrm{tr}(A) \text{ and hence } p \gg \log m \left\| A \right\|_F^2 / \mathrm{tr}(A)^2$$

which is satisfied by (9) given that $\frac{\left\| A \right\|_2}{\mathrm{tr}(A)} \geq \frac{\left\| A \right\|_F^2}{\mathrm{tr}(A)^2}$, which in turn is due to $\left\| A \right\|_F^2 \leq \mathrm{tr}(A) \left\| A \right\|_2$. □

Corollary 2.6. *Suppose that* (9) *and all conditions in Corollary 2.4 hold. Assume* $EX_i^2 = 1$. *Then with probability at least* $1 - \frac{4}{m^4}$, $\left|X^T D_0 D_\xi D_0 X\right| = p\mathrm{tr}(A_0)(1 + o(1))$.

Proof. First by independence of X and ξ, we have for $\mathbb{E}X_i^2 = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}X^T A_\xi X &= \mathbb{E}\sum_{k=1}^m X_k^2 A_{\xi,kk} = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}(X_k^2)\mathbb{E}(A_{\xi,kk}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}X_k^2 \mathbb{E}\sum_{\ell=1}^m \xi_\ell d_{k\ell}^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^m p_\ell \sum_{k=1}^m d_{k\ell}^2 = \sum_{\ell=1}^m p_\ell a_{\ell\ell}.\end{aligned}$$

We have by Corollary 2.4, with probability at least $1 - \frac{4}{m^4}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|X^T D_0 D_\xi D_0 X\right| &\le \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii} p_i + CK^2 \log^{1/2} m \left(\log^{1/2} m \left\|A_0\right\|_2 + \sqrt{\bar{M}}\right) \\ &\le p\left\|D_0\right\|_F^2 + CK^2 \log^{1/2} m \left(\log^{1/2} m \left\|A_0\right\|_2 + \sqrt{p}\left\|\mathrm{diag}(A_0)\right\|_F + p\left\|\mathrm{offd}(A_0)\right\|_F\right).\end{aligned}$$

for some absolute constants C, where $\sqrt{\bar{M}} \le \sqrt{p}\left\|\mathrm{diag}(A_0)\right\|_F + p\left\|\mathrm{offd}(A_0)\right\|_F$. The rest of the proof for Corollary 2.6 follows from that of Corollary 2.5. □

2.1 Implications when $p_1, \ldots, p_m$ are not the same

We first need the following sharp statements about eigenvalues of a Hadamard product. See for example Theorem 5.3.4 [8].

Theorem 2.7. *Let* $A, B \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times m}$ *be positive semidefinite. Let* $a_\infty := \max_{i=1}^m a_{ii}$ *and* $b_\infty := \max_{i=1}^m b_{ii}$. *Any eigenvalue of* $\lambda(A \circ B)$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{\min}(A)\lambda_{\min}(B) &\le (\min_{i=1}^m a_{ii})\lambda_{\min}(B) \\ &\le \lambda(A \circ B) \\ &\le a_\infty \lambda_{\max}(B) \le \lambda_{\max}(A)\lambda_{\max}(B).\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.8. *Suppose all conditions in Theorem 1.2 hold. Suppose* $EX_i^2 = 1$. *Let* $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_m)$. *Let* $|\mathbf{p}|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^m p_i$ *and* $\|\mathbf{p}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m p_i^2$. *Then with probability at lest* $1 - 4/m^4$,

$$\left|X^T D_0 D_\xi D_0 X\right| \le \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \left\|d_i\right\|_2^2 + CK^2 \log^{1/2} m \left\|D_0\right\|_2 \left(\log^{1/2} m \left\|D_0\right\|_2 + 2(\max_i \left\|d_i\right\|_2)\left|\mathbf{p}\right|_1^{1/2}\right).$$

Proof. Recall $A_0 = (a_{ij}) = D_0^2 \succeq 0$, and $a_\infty := \max_{i=1}^m a_{ii} = \max_i \left\|d_i\right\|_2^2$. Thus we have $a_\infty \le \left\|D_0\right\|_2^2$. Denote by $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_m)$. We have by Theorem 2.7,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{M} &= \sum_{i=1}^m p_i a_{ii}^2 + \sum_{i\ne j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j \le \sum_{i=1}^m p_i a_{ii}^2 + \mathbf{p}^T(A_0 \circ A_0)\mathbf{p} \\ &\le a_\infty^2 \left|\mathbf{p}\right|_1 + \lambda_{\max}(A_0 \circ A_0)\left\|\mathbf{p}\right\|_2^2 \\ &\le a_\infty^2 \left|\mathbf{p}\right|_1 + a_\infty \left\|A_0\right\|_2 \left\|\mathbf{p}\right\|_2^2 \le 2a_\infty \left\|A_0\right\|_2 \left|\mathbf{p}\right|_1.\end{aligned}$$

where $\left\|\mathbf{p}\right\|_2^2 \le \left|\mathbf{p}\right|_1$. The corollary thus follows immediately from Theorem 1.2. □

Remark 2.9. *Assume that $p_i \geq \frac{\log m}{m}$ and hence $|\mathbf{p}|_1 \geq \log m$. Then we have $\|\mathbf{p}\|_2 \leq |\mathbf{p}|_1^{1/2} \leq |\mathbf{p}|_1$. Notice that the second term starts to dominate when $|\mathbf{p}|_1^{1/2} \gg \log m$ while the total deviation remains to be a small order of the mean $\sum_{i=1}^m p_i \|d_i\|_2^2$ so long as*

$$|\mathbf{p}|_1 \gg \frac{\max_k \|d_k\|_2^2 \|D_0\|_2^2}{\min_k \|d_k\|_2^4}.$$

We use the following properties of the Hadamard product [8],

$$\begin{aligned} A \circ xx^T &= D_x A D_x \\ \text{and } \operatorname{tr}(D_\xi A D_\xi A^T) &= \xi^T (A \circ A) \xi \end{aligned}$$

from which a simple consequence is $\operatorname{tr}(D_\xi A D_\xi) = \xi^T (A \circ I)\xi = \xi^T \operatorname{diag}(A))\xi$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The structure of our proof follows that of Theorem 1.1 by [12]. The problem reduces to estimating the diagonal and the off-diagonal sums.

Part I: Diagonal Sum. Define

$$S_0 := \sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk}\xi_k X_k^2 - \mathbb{E}\sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk}\xi_k X_k^2 \quad \text{where } \mathbb{E}\sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk}\xi_k X_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk} p_k \mathbb{E} X_k^2. \tag{10}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let X and ξ be defined as in Theorem 1.1. Let A be an $m \times m$ matrix. Then, for every $t > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk}\xi_k X_k^2 - \sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk} p_k \mathbb{E} X_k^2 \right| > t \right) \leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(S_0 \geq t\right) \\ &\leq \quad 2\exp\left[-\frac{1}{4e} \min\left(\frac{t^2}{3K^4 \sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk}^2 p_k}, \frac{t}{K^2 \max_k |a_{kk}|} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We prove Lemma 3.1 after we state Lemma 3.2.

For the general case where X_k are mean-zero independent sub-gaussian random variables with $\|X_i\|_{\psi_2} \leq K$. We first state the following bound on the moment generating function of X_k^2. The proof follows essentially that of Lemma 5.15 in [14]; see Appendix A for details.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $|\lambda| < 1/(4eK^2 \max_k |a_{kk}|)$. Then for all k, we have for all $a_{kk} \in \mathbf{R}$*

$$\mathbb{E}\exp\left(\lambda a_{kk} X_k^2\right) - 1 \leq \lambda a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2 + 16\lambda^2 a_{kk}^2 K^4. \tag{11}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We first state some simple fact: $\max_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E} X_i^2 \leq K^2$. By independence of

$X_1, \ldots, X_k$ and $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k$, we bound the moment generating function of S_0 as follows: for $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{4eK^2 \max_k |a_{kk}|}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda S_0) &= \mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda \sum_{k=1}^m \xi_k X_k^2 a_{kk} - \lambda \sum_{k=1}^m p_k a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2) \\
&= \prod_{k=1}^m \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda a_{kk} \xi_k X_k^2)}{\exp(\lambda p_k a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2)} \right) = \prod_{k=1}^m \frac{\mathbb{E}_\xi \mathbb{E}_X \exp(\lambda a_{kk} \xi_k X_k^2)}{\exp(\lambda p_k a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2)} \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^m \frac{1 + p_k \left(\lambda a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2 + 16 \lambda^2 a_{kk}^2 K^4 \right)}{\exp(\lambda p_k a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2)} \\
&\leq \prod_{k=1}^m \frac{\exp\left(\lambda p_k a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2 + 16 \lambda^2 p_k a_{kk}^2 K^4 \right)}{\exp(\lambda p_k a_{kk} \mathbb{E} X_k^2)} = \exp\left(16 \lambda^2 K^4 \sum_{k=1}^m p_k a_{kk}^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (11) for the first inequality and the fact that $1 + x \leq e^x$ for the second inequality. Hence for $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4eK^2 \max_k |a_{kk}|}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_0 > t \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda S_0)}{e^{\lambda t}} \leq \exp\left(-\lambda t + 16 K^4 \lambda^2 \sum_{k=1}^m p_k a_{kk}^2 \right)$$

for which the optimal choice of λ is

$$\lambda = \min\left(\frac{t}{32 K^4 \sum_{k=1}^m p_k a_{kk}^2}, \frac{1}{4eK^2 \max_k |a_{kk}|} \right) \tag{12}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk} \xi_k X_k^2 - \sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk} p_k \mathbb{E} X_k^2 > t \right) \\
&\quad \leq \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4e} \min\left(\frac{t^2}{3K^4 \sum_{k=1}^m p_k a_{kk}^2}, \frac{t}{K^2 \max_k |a_{kk}|} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We note that these constants have not been optimized. Repeating the arguments for $-A$ instead of A, we obtain for every $t > 0$, and for $S_0' := \sum_{k=1}^m (-a_{kk}) \xi_k X_k^2 - \sum_{k=1}^m (-a_{kk}) p_k \mathbb{E} X_k^2$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk} \xi_k X_k^2 - \sum_{k=1}^m a_{kk} p_k \mathbb{E} X_k^2 < -t \right) = \mathbb{P}\left(S_0' > t \right) \\
&\quad \leq \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4e} \min\left(\frac{t^2}{3K^4 \sum_{k=1}^m p_k a_{kk}^2}, \frac{t}{K^2 \max_k |a_{kk}|} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The lemma thus holds. □

Part II: Off-diagonal Sum. We now focus on bounding the off-diagonal part of the sum:

$$S_{\text{offd}} := \sum_{i \neq j}^m a_{ij} X_i X_j \xi_i \xi_j \tag{13}$$

where by independence of X and ξ, $\mathbb{E}S_{\text{offd}} = \sum_{i\neq j}^{m} a_{ij}\mathbb{E}X_i\mathbb{E}X_j\mathbb{E}\xi_i\mathbb{E}\xi_j = 0$.

We will show that the following large deviation inequality holds for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|S_{\text{offd}}| > t\right) \quad \leq \quad 2\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{K^4\sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j}, \frac{t}{K^2\left\|A\right\|_2}\right)\right) \tag{14}$$

First we prove a bound on the moment generating function for the off-diagonal sum S_{offd}. We assume without loss of generality that $K = 1$ by replacing X with X/K. Let C_4 be a constant to be specified. It holds that for all $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_4}\|A\|_2}$

$$\mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda S_{\text{offd}}) \quad \leq \quad \exp\left(1.44C_4\lambda^2\sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j\right). \tag{15}$$

The proof of (15) follows essentially from the decoupling and reduction arguments in [12] and thus omitted from the main body of the paper. For completeness, we include the full proof in Appendix B. See for example [4, 3] for comprehensive discussions on modern decoupling methods.

Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_{\text{offd}} > t\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda S_{\text{offd}})}{e^{\lambda t}} \leq \exp\left(-\lambda t + 1.44C_4\lambda^2\sum_{i\neq j} p_i p_j a_{ij}^2\right). \tag{16}$$

Optimizing over λ, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_{\text{offd}} > t\right) \leq \exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{\sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j}, \frac{t}{\left\|A\right\|_2}\right)\right) =: q_1 \tag{17}$$

Repeating the arguments for $-A$ instead of A, we obtain for $S' := \sum_{i\neq j}^{m}(-a_{ij})X_iX_j\xi_i\xi_j = -S_{\text{offd}}$, $0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_4}\|A\|_2}$ and $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S' > t\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda S')}{e^{\lambda t}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\exp(-\lambda S_{\text{offd}})}{e^{\lambda t}} \leq \exp\left(-\lambda t + 1.44C_4\lambda^2\sum_{i\neq j} p_i p_j a_{ij}^2\right) \leq q_1 \tag{18}$$

by (15) and (17). Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|S_{\text{offd}}| > t\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(S_{\text{offd}} > t\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(S_{\text{offd}} < -t\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(S_{\text{offd}} > t\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(S' > t\right) = 2q_1. \tag{19}$$

Thus (14) holds for all $t > 0$. The theorem is thus proved by summing up the bad events for diagonal sum and the non-diagonal sum while adjusting the constant c in (6). □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

First recall the following definitions. Let $K = 1$. Partition a symmetric matrix $D_0 \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times m}$ according to its columns as $D_0 = [d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m]$. Recall $A_0 := D_0^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i d_i^T = (a_{ij}) \succeq 0$. Denote by

$A_\xi = D_0 D_\xi D_0$, we have $\|A_\xi\|_2 = \|D_0 D_\xi\|_2^2 \le \|A_0\|_2$, By Theorem 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\left|X^T A_\xi X - \mathbb{E}(X^T A_\xi X|\xi)\right| > t|\xi\right) \\
&\le \quad 2\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{\|A_\xi\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{\|A_\xi\|_2}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

First note that $(a+b)/2 \le \max(a,b) \le a+b$ for $a, b > 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\exp(-1/x)+\exp(-y)}{2} &\le \exp\{\max(-\frac{1}{x}, -y)\} \\
&:= \exp(-\min(1/x, y)) \le \exp(-1/x) + \exp(-y).
\end{aligned}$$

The function $x \mapsto \exp(-1/x)$ is concave for positive x. Thus we have by Jensen's inequality, for $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\left|X^T A_\xi X - \mathbb{E}(X^T A_\xi X|\xi)\right| > t\right) &= \mathbb{E}_\xi \mathbb{P}\left(\left|X^T A_\xi X - \mathbb{E}(X^T A_\xi X|\xi)\right| > t|\xi\right) \\
&\le \mathbb{E}_\xi\left(2\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{\|A_\xi\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{\|A_0\|_2}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\le \mathbb{E}_\xi\left(2\exp\left(\frac{-ct^2}{\|A_\xi\|_F^2}\right) + 2\exp\left(\frac{-ct}{\|A_0\|_2}\right)\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_\xi\left(2\exp\left(\frac{-ct^2}{\|A_\xi\|_F^2}\right)\right) + 2\exp\left(\frac{-ct}{\|A_0\|_2}\right) \\
&\le 2\exp\left(\frac{-ct^2}{\mathbb{E}_\xi\|A_\xi\|_F^2}\right) + 2\exp\left(\frac{-ct}{\|A_0\|_2}\right) \\
&\le 4\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{\mathbb{E}\|A_\xi\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{\|A_0\|_2}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}\|A_\xi\|_F^2 = \mathbb{E}\xi^T(A_0 \circ A_0)\xi = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 p_i + \sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j$. To finish the proof, we need a large deviation bound for $S_\star := \mathbb{E}(X^T A_\xi X|\xi) - \mathbb{E}(X^T A_\xi X)$ which follows from Corollary 4.1, given that

$$S_\star = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}(X_k^2) A_{\xi,kk} - \mathbb{E}(X_k^2)\mathbb{E}(A_{\xi,kk}) = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}(X_k^2)(\sum_{\ell=1}^m d_{k\ell}^2(\xi_\ell - \mathbb{E}\xi_\ell)). \tag{20}$$

We have the following large deviation bound for $S_\star$.

Corollary 4.1. *Let X, ξ be as defined in Theorem 1.2. Let $a_\infty = \max_i a_{ii} = \max_i \|d_i\|_2^2$. For all $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|S_\star| > t\right) \le 2\exp\left(-c\min\left(\frac{t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2 a_{ii}^2}, \frac{t}{4a_\infty}\right)\right)$$

where $\sigma_i^2 = p_i(1-p_i)$.

Theorem 1.2 is thus proved by the triangle inequality while adjusting the constant c. □

It remains to prove Corollary 4.1.

We need the following result which follows from Proposition 3.4 in [13].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $m \times m$ matrix. Let $a_\infty := \max_i |a_{ii}|$. Let $\xi = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m) \in \{0,1\}^m$ be a random vector with independent Bernoulli random variables ξ_i such that $\xi_i = 1$ with probability p_i and 0 otherwise. Then for $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{4a_\infty}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\left(\lambda \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}(\xi_i - p_i)\right) \quad \leq \quad \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 e^{|\lambda| a_\infty} \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \sigma_i^2\right)$$

where $\sigma_i^2 = p_i(1-p_i)$.

We first state an estimate on the moment generating function of $S_\star$ in Lemma 4.3, which follows from Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $A_\xi = D_0 D_\xi D_0$ where $D_0 = [d_1, \ldots, d_m]$. Let X, ξ be as defined in Theorem 1.2 with $K = 1$. Let $a_{ii} = \|d_i\|_2^2$. Let $a_\infty = \max_i \|d_i\|_2^2$. Then for $|\lambda| < \frac{1}{4a_\infty}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda S_\star) \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 e^{|\lambda| a_\infty} \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \sigma_i^2\right) \quad \textit{where} \quad \mathbb{E}(X_k^2) \leq \|X_k\|_{\psi_2} = 1$$

and $\sigma_i^2 = p_i(1-p_i)$.

Proof. We have by independence of X and ξ and by definition of $S_\star$,

$$S_\star \quad = \quad \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}(X_k^2) \sum_{i=1}^m d_{ki}^2(\xi_i - p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}(X_k^2) d_{ki}^2\right)(\xi_i - p_i) =: \sum_{i=1}^m a'_{ii}(\xi_i - p_i).$$

where by assumption, we have $\mathbb{E}(X_k^2) \leq \|X_k\|_{\psi_2} \leq K = 1$ and hence

$$0 \leq a'_{ii} := \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbb{E}(X_k^2) d_{ki}^2 \leq a_{ii} \quad \text{and thus} \quad \max_i \left|a'_{ii}\right| \leq a_\infty.$$

The bound on the mgf of $S_\star$ follows from Lemma 4.2. For $|\lambda| < \frac{1}{4a_\infty}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda S_\star) \quad &= \quad \mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda \sum_{i=1}^m a'_{ii}(\xi_i - p_i)) \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 e^{|\lambda| a_\infty} \sum_{i=1}^m (a'_{ii})^2 \sigma_i^2\right) \\ &\leq \quad \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 e^{|\lambda| a_\infty} \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \sigma_i^2\right) \leq \exp\left(0.65\lambda^2 \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ii}^2 \sigma_i^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Corollary 4.1. By Lemma 4.3 for $0 < \lambda < \frac{1}{4a_\infty}$, and $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S_\star > t) \quad &\leq \quad \frac{\mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda S_\star)}{e^{\lambda t}} \leq \exp\left(-\lambda t + 0.65\lambda^2 (\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2 a_{ii}^2)\right) \\ &\leq \quad \exp\left(-c \min\left(\frac{t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2 a_{ii}^2}, \frac{t}{a_\infty}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(S_\star < -t) \quad = \quad \mathbb{P}(-S_\star > t) = \frac{\mathbb{E} \exp(-\lambda S_\star)}{e^{\lambda t}} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \exp(\lambda S_\star)}{e^{\lambda t}} = \mathbb{P}(S_\star > t).$$

and hence $\mathbb{P}(|S_\star| > t) = 2\mathbb{P}(S_\star) > t$. The Corollary is thus proved. □

Acknowledgements

Mark Rudelson encouraged me to apply the method from [12] to prove the first result in the current paper. The original proof of Theorem 1.2 follows a similar structure to the proof of Theorem 1.1, where the author introduced the bounds on the moment generating functions (mgf) corresponding to the diagonal and off-diagonal sums which lead to the large deviation bounds as stated in Theorem 1.2. These mgf bounds could be of independent interests and are proved in the original manuscript [16]. The author however presents in the present paper the current proof which is suggested by Tailen Hsing. We note that the same proof will lead to the large deviation bound in Theorem 1.1 as well. The author is grateful for the intensive discussions with Tailen Hsing and Mark Rudelson, which helped improving the presentation of this paper tremendously. This work was supported in part by NSF under Grant DMS-1316731 and Elizabeth Caroline Crosby Funding from the Advance Program at the University of Michigan.

A Proof of Lemma 3.2

Note that the following holds [14](cf. Lemma 5.14)

$$\|X_i\|_{\psi_2}^2 \leq \left\|X_i^2\right\|_{\psi_1} \leq 2\|X_i\|_{\psi_2}^2 = 2K^2.$$

For all k, let $Y_k := X_k^2/\left\|X_k^2\right\|_{\psi_1}$. By definition, Y_k is a sub-exponential random variable with $\|Y_k\|_{\psi_1} = 1$. We now set $t_k := \lambda a_{kk}\left\|X_k^2\right\|_{\psi_1}$. First we use the Taylor expansions to obtain for all k,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\exp(t_k Y_k) := \mathbb{E}\exp\left(\lambda a_{kk} X_k^2\right) &= 1 + t_k\mathbb{E}Y_k + \sum_{p=2}^{\infty}\frac{t_k^p \mathbb{E}Y_k^p}{p!} \\
&\leq 1 + \lambda a_{kk}\mathbb{E}X_k^2 + \frac{|t_k|^2 e^2}{2\sqrt{\pi}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6\pi}}\sum_{p=3}^{\infty}(e|t_k|)^p \\
&= 1 + \lambda a_{kk}\mathbb{E}X_k^2 + \frac{|t_k|^2 e^2}{2\sqrt{\pi}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6\pi}}2(e|t_k|)^3 \\
&< 1 + \lambda a_{kk}\mathbb{E}X_k^2 + e^2(\lambda a_{kk}\left\|X_k^2\right\|_{\psi_1})^2\left(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6\pi}}\right) \leq 1 + \lambda a_{kk}\mathbb{E}X_k^2 + 16|\lambda a_{kk}|^2 K^4.
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$e|t_k| \leq \frac{|a_{kk}|\left\|X_k^2\right\|_{\psi_1}}{4K^2\max_k|a_{kk}|} < \frac{1}{2}$$

and $2(e|t_k|)^3 \leq (e|t_k|)^2$. The lemma is thus proved. □

B Proof of (15)

The proof structure follows from the proof of Theorem 2.1 [12]. Recall $S := \sum_{i\neq j}^m a_{ij}X_iX_j\xi_i\xi_j$. We start with a decoupling step.

Step 1. Decoupling. Let $\delta = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_m) \in \{0,1\}^m$ be a random vector with independent Bernoulli random variables with $\mathbb{E}\delta_i = 1/2$, which is independent of X and ξ. Let X_{Λ_δ} denote $(X_i)_{i\in\Lambda_\delta}$ for a set $\Lambda_\delta := \{i \in [m] : \delta_i = 1\}$. Let $\mathbb{E}_X$, $\mathbb{E}_\xi$ and $\mathbb{E}_\delta$ denote the expectation with respect to random variables in X, ξ and δ respectively. Now consider random variable

$$S_\delta := \sum_{i,j} \delta_i(1-\delta_j)a_{ij}X_iX_j\xi_i\xi_j \text{ and hence } S = 4\mathbb{E}_\delta S_\delta.$$

By Jensen's inequality, for all $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda S) = \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_X \exp(\mathbb{E}_\delta 4\lambda S_\delta) \le \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_X\mathbb{E}_\delta \exp(4\lambda S_\delta). \tag{21}$$

where the last step holds because e^{aS_δ} is convex on $\mathbf{R}$ for any $a \in \mathbf{R}$.

Consider $\Lambda_\delta := \{i \in [m] : \delta_i = 1\}$. Denote by $f(\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta})$ the conditional moment generating function of random variable S_δ:

$$f(\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta}) := \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(4\lambda S_\delta)|\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta}\right).$$

Conditioned upon X_{Λ_δ} for a fixed realization of ξ and δ, we rewrite S_δ

$$S_\delta := \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta, j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}X_iX_j\xi_i\xi_j = \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} X_j\left(\xi_j\sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}X_i\xi_i\right)$$

as a linear combination of mean-zero subgaussian random variables $X_j, j \in \Lambda_\delta^c$, with fixed coefficients. Thus the conditional distribution of S_δ is sub-gaussian with ψ_2 norm being upper bounded by the ℓ_2 norm of the coefficient vector $(\xi_j\sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}X_i\xi_i)_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c}$ [14](cf. Lemma 5.9).

Thus, conditioned upon ξ, δ and X_{Λ_δ},

$$\|S_\delta\|_{\psi_2} \le C_0\sigma_{\delta,\xi} \text{ where } \sigma^2_{\delta,\xi} = \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c}\xi_j\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}X_i\xi_i\right)^2. \tag{22}$$

Thus we have for some large absolute $C > 0$

$$f(\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(4\lambda S_\delta)|\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta}\right) \le \exp(C\lambda^2\|S_\delta\|^2_{\psi_2}) \le \exp(C'\lambda^2\sigma^2_{\delta,\xi}). \tag{23}$$

Taking the expectations of both sides with respect to X_{Λ_δ} and ξ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_{X_{\Lambda_\delta}} f(\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta}) &= \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_{X_{\Lambda_\delta}}\mathbb{E}\left(\exp(4\lambda S_\delta)|\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta}\right) \\ &\le \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_{X_{\Lambda_\delta}} \exp(C'\lambda^2\sigma^2_{\delta,\xi}) =: \widetilde{f}_\delta\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Step 2. Reduction to normal random variables. Let δ, ξ and X_{Λ_δ} be a fixed realization of the random vectors defined as above. Let $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_n)$, where g_i i.i.d. $\sim N(0,1)$. Let $\mathbb{E}_g$ denote the expectation with respect to random variables in g. Consider random variable

$$Z := \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} g_j\left(\xi_j\sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}X_i\xi_i\right)$$

By the rotation invariance of normal distribution, for a fixed realization of random vectors ξ, δ, X, the conditional distribution of Z follows $N(0, \sigma^2_{\delta,\xi})$ for $\sigma^2_{\delta,\xi}$ as defined in (22). Thus we obtain the conditional moment generating function for Z denoted by

$$\mathbb{E}_g(\exp(tZ)) := \mathbb{E}(\exp(tZ)|\xi, \delta, X_{\Lambda_\delta}) = \exp(t^2\sigma^2_{\delta,\xi}/2).$$

Choose $t = C_1\lambda$ where $C_1 = \sqrt{2C'}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_g(\exp(C_1\lambda Z)) = \exp(C'\lambda^2\sigma^2_{\delta,\xi}) \text{ which matches the RHS of (23).}$$

Hence for a fixed realization of δ, we can calculate $\widetilde{f_\delta}$ using Z as follows:

$$\widetilde{f_\delta} := \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_X \exp(C'\lambda^2\sigma^2_{\delta,\xi}) = \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_X\mathbb{E}_g(\exp(C_1\lambda Z)) = \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(C_1\lambda Z)|\delta\right). \tag{25}$$

Conditioned on δ, ξ and g, we can re-express Z:

$$Z = \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} X_i \left(\xi_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda^c_\delta} a_{ij}g_j\xi_j\right)$$

as a linear combination of subgaussian random variables $X_i, i \in \Lambda_\delta$ with fixed coefficients, which immediately imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\exp(C_1\lambda Z)|\delta,\xi,g) &\leq \exp(C_2\lambda^2 \|Z\|^2_{\psi_2}) \\ &\leq \exp\left(C_3\lambda^2 \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta}\xi_i\left(\sum_{j\in\Lambda^c_\delta} a_{ij}g_j\xi_j\right)^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Let P_δ denote the coordinate projection of $\mathbf{R}^m$ onto $\mathbf{R}^{\Lambda_\delta}$. Then conditioned on δ, we have by definition of $\widetilde{f_\delta}$ as in (25) and the bounds on the conditional moment generating function of Z immediately above,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{f_\delta} &= \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(C_1\lambda Z)|\delta\right) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi,g}\mathbb{E}\left(\exp(C_1\lambda Z)|\delta,\xi,g\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_g\left[\exp\left(C_3\lambda^2\sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta}\xi_i\left(\sum_{j\in\Lambda^c_\delta}a_{ij}g_j\xi_j\right)^2\right)|\delta\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_g\left[\exp\left(C_3\lambda^2\|D_\xi P_\delta A(I-P_\delta)D_\xi g\|_2^2\right)|\delta\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}_g\left[\exp\left(C_3\lambda^2\|A_{\delta,\xi}g\|_2^2\right)|\delta\right]\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where we denote by $A_{\delta,\xi} := D_\xi P_\delta A(I-P_\delta)D_\xi$. We will integrate g out followed by ξ in the next two steps.

Step 3. Integrating out the normal random variables. Conditioned upon δ and ξ and by the rotation invariance of g, the random variables $\|A_{\delta,\xi}g\|_2^2$ follows the same distribution as $\sum_i s_i^2 g_i^2$ where s_i denote the singular values of $A_{\delta,\xi}$, with

$$\begin{aligned}\max_i s_i &= \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^T_{\delta,\xi}A_{\delta,\xi})} =: \|A_{\delta,\xi}\|_2 \leq \|A\|_2, \quad \text{and} \\ \sum_i s_i^2 = \|A_{\delta,\xi}\|_F^2 &= \operatorname{tr}(A_{\delta,\xi}A^T_{\delta,\xi}) = \operatorname{tr}(D_\xi P_\delta A(I-P_\delta)D_\xi A^T P_\delta D_\xi) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}(D_\xi P_\delta A(I-P_\delta)D_\xi A^T) = \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta}\xi_i\sum_{j\in\Lambda^c_\delta}a_{ij}^2\xi_j\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

First we note that $g_i^2, \forall i$ follow the χ^2 distribution with one degree of freedom, and $\mathbb{E}\exp(tg^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-2t}} \leq e^{2t}$ for $t < 1/4$. Thus we have for a fixed realization of δ, ξ, and for all $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_3}\|A\|_2}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp(C_3\lambda^2 s_i^2 g_i^2)|\delta,\xi\right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-2C_3\lambda^2 s_i^2}} \leq \exp(2C_3\lambda^2 s_i^2).$$

Hence for any fixed δ and ξ, and for $C_4 = 2C_3$ and $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_3}\|A\|_2}$, we have by independence of $g_1, g_2, \ldots,$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(C_3\lambda^2 \|A_{\delta,\xi}g\|_2^2\right)|\delta,\xi\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(C_3\lambda^2 \sum_i s_i^2 g_i^2\right)|\delta,\xi\right] \\
&= \prod_i \mathbb{E}\left[\exp(C_3\lambda^2 s_i^2 g_i^2)|\delta,\xi\right] \\
&\leq \prod_i \exp(2C_3\lambda^2 s_i^2). \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have by (26), (27) and (28)

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{f}_\delta &\leq \mathbb{E}_\xi\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(C_3\lambda^2 \|A_{\delta,\xi}g\|_2^2\right)|\delta,\xi\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp(2C_3\lambda^2\sum_i s_i^2)|\delta\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(C_4\lambda^2 \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta}\xi_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2\xi_j\right)|\delta\right]. \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

The key observation here is we are dealing with a quadratic form on the RHS of (29) which is already decoupled thanks to the decoupling Step 1.

Step 4. Integrating out the Bernoulli random variables. For any given realization of δ, we now need to bound the moment generating function for the decoupled quadratic form on the RHS of (29), which is the content of Lemma B.1 where we take $t = C_4\lambda^2$ and conclude that for all δ and for all $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_4}\|A\|_2}$,

$$\widetilde{f}_\delta \leq \exp\left(1.44C_4\lambda^2 \sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j\right).$$

Lemma B.1. *Let $0 < \tau \leq \frac{1}{4\|A\|_2^2}$. For any fixed realization of δ, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(t\sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta}\xi_i\sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2\xi_j\right)|\delta\right] \leq \exp\left(1.44\tau\sum_{i\neq j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j\right).$$

Proof. As mentioned, we are dealing with a quadratic form which is already decoupled. Thus we integrate out ξ_i for all $i \in \Lambda_\delta$ followed by those in Λ_δ^c. Recall for any realization of δ and $0 < \tau \leq \frac{1}{4\|A\|_2^2}$ we have by

independence of $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_\delta &:= \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} \xi_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) |\delta\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} \xi_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) |\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}, \delta\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}} \prod_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\tau\xi_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) |\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}, \delta\right] \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

We will use the following approximation twice in our proof:

$$e^x - 1 \le 1.2x \quad \text{which holds for} \quad 0 \le x \le 0.35. \tag{31}$$

First notice that for all realizations of δ and ξ, we have for $0 < \tau \le \frac{1}{4\|A\|_2^2}$

$$0 < \tau \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j \le \tau \sum_j a_{ij}^2 \le \tau \|A\|_2^2 \le 1/4$$

given that the maximum row ℓ_2 norm of A is bounded by the operator norm of matrix A^T: $\left\|A^T\right\|_2 = \|A\|_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^T A)}$. Hence, we have for $|\lambda| \le \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_4}\|A\|_2}$, (31) and the fact that $1 + x \le e^x$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\tau\xi_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) |\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}, \delta\right] &= p_i \exp\left(\tau \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) + (1 - p_i) \\ &\le p_i \left(1.2\tau \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) + 1 \le \exp\left(1.2\tau p_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right). \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Thus we have by independence of $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots$, (30) and (32)

$$\begin{aligned} f_\delta &\le \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}} \prod_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} \exp\left(1.2\tau p_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}} \exp\left(\sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} 1.2\tau p_i \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} a_{ij}^2 \xi_j\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{\Lambda_\delta^c}} \exp\left(1.2\tau \sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} \xi_j \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) = \prod_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_j} \exp\left(1.2\tau\xi_j \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) \\ &= \prod_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} p_j \exp\left(1.2\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) + (1 - p_j) \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where for all δ and $0 < \tau \le \frac{1}{4\|A\|_2^2}$, we have by the approximation in (31)

$$\exp\left(1.2\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) - 1 \le 1.44\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i \tag{34}$$

given that the column ℓ_2 norm of A is bounded by the operator norm of A, and thus

$$1.2\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i \le 1.2\tau \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij}^2 p_i \le 1.2 \sum_{i=1}^m a_{ij}^2/(4\|A\|_2^2) \le 0.3.$$

Now by (33), (34) and the fact that $x+1 \le e^x$

$$\begin{aligned} f_\delta &\le \prod_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} p_j \left[\exp\left(1.2\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) - 1\right] + 1 \\ &\le \prod_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} p_j \left(1.44\tau \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) + 1 \le \prod_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} \exp\left(1.44\tau p_j \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\sum_{j\in\Lambda_\delta^c} 1.44\tau p_j \sum_{i\in\Lambda_\delta} a_{ij}^2 p_i\right) \le \exp\left(1.44\tau \sum_{i\ne j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j\right) \end{aligned}$$

The lemma thus holds. □

Step 5. Putting things together.

By Jensen's inequality (21), definition of $f(\xi,\delta,X_{\Lambda_\delta})$ in (23) and (24), we have for all $|\lambda| \le \frac{1}{2\sqrt{C_4}\|A\|_2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\exp(\lambda S) &\le \mathbb{E}_\delta \mathbb{E}_\xi \mathbb{E}_X \exp(4\lambda S_\delta) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\delta \mathbb{E}_\xi \mathbb{E}_{X_{\Lambda_\delta}} \mathbb{E}\left(\exp(4\lambda S_\delta)|\xi,\delta,X_{\Lambda_\delta}\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\delta \mathbb{E}_\xi \mathbb{E}_{X_{\Lambda_\delta}} f(\xi,\delta,X_{\Lambda_\delta}) \\ &\le \mathbb{E}_\delta \widetilde{f}_\delta \le \exp\left(1.44 C_4 \lambda^2 \sum_{i\ne j} a_{ij}^2 p_i p_j\right) \end{aligned}$$

Thus (15) holds. □

References

[1] R. Adamczak and P. Wolff. Concentration inequalities for non-lipschitz functions with bounded derivatives of higher order. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162(3):531–586, 2015.

[2] F. Barthe and E. Milman. Transference principles for log-sobolev and spectral-gap with applications to conservative spin systems, 2012.

[3] V. H. de la Peña and E. Giné. *Decoupling. From dependence to independence. Probability and its Applications (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[4] V. H. de la Peña and S. J. Montgomery-Smith. Decoupling inequalities for the tail probabilities of multivariate u-statistics. *Ann. Probab.*, 23(2):806816, 1995.

[5] I. Diakonikolas, D. Kane, and J. Nelson. Bounded independence fools degree-2 threshold functions. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2010)*, 2010.

[6] A. Foucart and H. Rauhut. *A Mathematical Introduction to Compressive Sensing. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis*. Birkhauser, 2013.

[7] D. L. Hanson and E. T. Wright. A bound on tail probabilities for quadratic forms in independent random variables. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 42:1079–1083, 1971.

[8] R. Horn and C. Johnson. *Topics in Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press; Reprint edition, 1991.

[9] D. Hsu, S. Kakade, and T. Zhang. Tail inequalities for sums of random matrices that depend on the intrinsic dimension. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 17:1–13, 2012.

[10] R. Latala. Estimates of moments and tails of gaussian chaoses. *Ann. Probab*, 34(6):2315–2331, 2006.

[11] M. Rudelson. On the complexity of the set of unconditional convex bodies. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 2015. to appear.

[12] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. Hanson-Wright inequality and sub-gaussian concentration. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 18:1–9, 2013.

[13] M. Talagrand. Sections of smooth convex bodies via majorizing measures. *Acta. Math.*, 175:273–300, 1995.

[14] R. Vershynin. *Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices*. Cambridge University Press, 2012. Chapter 5 of the book Compressed Sensing, Theory and Applications, ed. Y. Eldar and G. Kutyniok.

[15] E. T. Wright. A bound on tail probabilities for quadratic forms in independent random variables whose distributions are not necessarily symmetric. *Ann. Probab.*, 1:1068–1070, 1973.

[16] S. Zhou. Sparse hanson-wright inequalities for subgaussian quadratic forms. Technical report, Technical report 539, Department of Statistics, University of Michigan, 2015.